2015-01-30

Meeting Information

Date:	January 30, 2015
Time:	9 MST/10 CST/11 EST/16 GMT/17 CET/18 EET

Attending: Erick Emde, Chair; Daniela Giordano; Co-Editor; Archana Aida, Panos Bamidis, Jyothi Holla, Jim Jahrling, John Nash, Emmanouil Skoufos, Susie Flynn, Valerie Smothers

The three newest members of the group provided brief introductions: Emmanouil is Director of Information Architecture and is part of a large learning and assessment solution group at Elsevier. Jim is the Director of Information Services for ABMS, and Susie is also from ABMS is the manager of Academic Services, working with the boards to develop and implement Maintenance of Certification programs.

Agenda Items

1 Review minutes

The minutes were accepted as submitted.

2 Review updates to spec

Daniela discussed the changes and additions in version 1.35. The consent fields were added in section 7.9, and consent is referenced in section 7.10. Consent provides a catalof reference, and entry within that cataloging system, and comments that may include information on where the consent information can be located. Daniela added we can't assume there should only be one catloguing system for consent forms. Valerie commented that the current schema only allows for one catalog and entry. Erick asked if the multiplicity should change. Valerie agreed; she will fix the multiplicity in the schema and send it to the group shortly.

3 Review PI CME discussion

Valerie mentioned Joythi had questions from the portfolio project as to whether PI CME credit should be a formal credit type. She noted the current credit types listed on page 39 of the document (CME, CE, CNE, CPE, and CHES, CPD). David Price's reply is linked from the agenda. He commented that PI CME is an activity format developed by the AMA. He recommended not having PI CME as a credit type. Jyothi indicated ABMS should weigh in on this discussion. Whatever the group decides needs to looks appropriate across boards. Jim and Susie agreed with Dr. Price. They would prefer PI CME be be represented as a format rather than a type. Valerie repled that activityOrResourceFormat (pg 32) could accommodate PI CME as a format for the activity. Within maintenance of certification you may use the AMA list format or another list as opposd to the Curriculum Inventory vocabulary that is linked form the document.

4 Discuss educational context vocabulary – proposed revisions

Valerie mentioned the IEEE LOM describes Educational Context element has a vocabulary that is not suitable for health professions education. The working group developed its own list of values for educational context in Healthcare LOM v 1. We are looking to update those values. Column A of the spreadsheet shows the LOM values for educational context. Column B shows the mEducator values for educational levels. Columns C and D show the MedEd portal values for intended audience. A proposed vocabulary for Healthcare Lom V2 is in Column E. The healthcare LOM v2 proposed vocabulary would add graduate education, which is included in MedEdPortal. Valerie noted that administration could be captured using the profession element.   The group agreed with the proposed addition of graduate education.

5 Proposal: New IndividualOrTeam element

Joythi brought forth the requirement for tracking whether a PI CME activity is designed for the individual or the team. A discussion followed about adding an element with two values, team and individual. Emmanouil asked about the multiplicity, and Valerie answered it would be zero or one. Susie asked what constitutes engagement or participation in awarding credits. Valerie added they track criteria in metadata catalog where learners are searching. Susie noted some boards have different criteria; engaging or participating will continue to evolve. Archana added some activities are both team-based and individual. Valerie suggested allowing the element appear multiple times. Erick asked whether it needed to be multiple or could it be values individual, team or both? Emmanouil's preference was to have two values, team and individual. Allowing multiple instances would make it reporting easier.

Valerie asked if engagement criteria belonged in the section on credits or somewhere else. Susie suggested having an element called engagement criteria, with a pointer to those details. Emmanouil and Erick were supportive of that. Susie mentioned engagement criteria would be focused around level of actual participation. Daniela didn't see the point of engagement criteria. Erick suggested more discussion was needed; this will be added to the agenda for the next meeting. Susie agreed to provide examples of different engagement criteria for next time.

Decisions

- PI CME would not require a change to creditType; instead it could be referenced using the activityOrResourceFormat element.
- The group will continue discussions regarding referencing engagement criteria.

Action Items

- Valerie will make consent a repeatable element in the schema and send a new image to Daniela for inclusion in the specification.
- Valerie will add graduate education as a value for educational context.
- Valerie will edit the schema to allow multiple instances of IndividualOrTeam to allow for the representation of activities that may be both.
- Susie will share examples of engagement criteria for the next meeting.